

Illinois U Library

JULY 11, 1950
620th BROADCAST

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

Broadcast by Stations of the American Broadcasting Co.



U.S. Pat. Off.

The Stake of Business in Our Foreign Policy

Guest Moderator, CHESTER S. WILLIAMS

Speakers

W. BALGOOYEN

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.

(See also page 12)

COMING

July 18, 1950

How Can We Strengthen Our World Position?

July 25, 1950

Is Freedom of Speech Threatened in America?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N. Y.

VOLUME 16, NUMBER 11  \$4.50 A YEAR: 10c A COPY



CONTENTS



The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.



THE BROADCAST OF JULY 11:

"The Stake of Business in Our Foreign Policy"

| | |
|---------------------------|----|
| Mr. WILLIAMS..... | 3 |
| Mr. BLAISDELL..... | 4 |
| Mr. BALGOOYEN..... | 6 |
| QUESTIONS, PLEASE!..... | 11 |
| THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN..... | 12 |



THE BROADCAST OF JULY 18:

"How Can We Strengthen Our World Position?"



THE BROADCAST OF JULY 25:

"Is Freedom of Speech Threatened in America?"



The Broadcast of July 11, 1950, originated at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York, in conjunction with the Second Annual Conference on American Foreign Policy, from 9:00 to 9:30 p.m., EDT, over the American Broadcasting Company Network.



Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. **Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y.** Subscription price, \$4.50 a year. 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Town Meeting

BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



JULY 11, 1950

VOL. 16, No. 11

The Stake of Business in Our Foreign Policy

Announcer:

Tonight your Town Meeting is proud to be a part of the Second Annual Conference on American Foreign Policy at Colgate University, Hamilton, New York. Situated in the beautiful and historic Chenango Valley, Colgate University was founded in the year 1819 by a group of 13 men with \$13 and 13 prayers.

Since last Saturday, high-ranking government, business, and labor leaders have participated in discussions on the general theme, "American Foreign Policy — An Offensive for Freedom." Town Meeting congratulates Colgate University and its faculty and administration for making a positive contribution to a better understanding of America's role in the critical world situation.

And now, substituting for George V. Denny, Jr., here is our guest moderator, Chester S. Williams, former director of the First World Town Hall Seminar and Deputy Chief of Public Information of the United States Mission to the United Nations. Mr. Williams. (*Applause*)

Moderator Williams:

Tonight, while 48 United Nations stand together in a great world front against aggression, we are going to discuss, "The Stake of Business in Our Foreign Policy."

This week, Congress has been considering the technical assistance program which was put forward by the President as Point Four of our foreign policy in his inaugural address. This issue is up for final congressional decision now—whether to appropriate \$10 million or the \$35 million asked for.

Now you may not think of yourself as a part of the business community, but you are in the business picture, with a personal stake in a thriving, expanding economy. You want to know whether our foreign policy encourages increasing production and trade to give us high level employment, markets for our farm products, and competitive prices for consumers.

You want to know whether our foreign policy is designed to improve world conditions and strengthen our friends and neighbors for peace and well-being. Business in the direct foreign trade, transportation, and foreign investment fields represents only one of the tenpins in our total business setup. But if that one tenpin should be bowled over, it would probably topple several others.

Now to help us explore the stake of business in our foreign policy, we have on the platform tonight a leading government administrator from the Department of Commerce and a successful business administrator engaged in international business operation.

Let us hear first from the government side. Town Meeting welcomes to its platform for the first time Mr. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Blaisdell has held executive positions in various government agencies for the past 17 years. From 1945 to 1947, he was chief of the Mission for Economic Affairs to London and held the rank of Minister. Mr. Blaisdell. (*Applause*)

Mr. Blaisdell:

My friends here on the Town Meeting of the Air, American business has an immediate stake in our foreign policy. It also has an underlying stake, along with the rest of the American people.

The immediate stake is the continued successful operation of firms which employ three million people. This concerns not only the businessmen, but the American men and women who are employed by our shipping and airplane companies, by steel companies, by engineering firms, and by automobile and textile manufacturers.

The range of business firms engaged in world trade covers the whole gamut of American life. Furthermore, it concerns American investors who own shares in the companies, such as the one represented by Mr. Balgooyen in South America, as well as the people who own the companies that furnish us oil from their foreign operations. It includes the people who

buy copper for their industrial undertakings and all of us who enjoy our coffee and our tea and who ride on rubber.

But the underlying stake of business in our foreign policy is more important. American businessmen want to retain the opportunity to sell their goods abroad, to make investments, or to buy what they want according to their own individual decisions. It is the policy of the government to create, in so far as it lies within its power, the conditions throughout the world which will preserve this freedom.

We Americans know that freedom in our ways of making a living cannot be separated from freedom to say what we think and to vote as we please. A line cannot be drawn between economic freedoms and political freedoms.

We are faced with a challenge today as important as any we have ever faced. It calls for an understanding of the way we live and the way we work, of the part government plays, and of the part that private business plays.

What have we done to carry out a policy of promoting business freedom? We've tried to build a free and independent way of doing business, sympathetic to our own, through the Marshall Plan, through the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program, through the International Trade Organization proposal, and through the proposals for and the carrying out of investment treaties.

Another opportunity is through Point Four, and this is an opportunity for both government and business. We have paid out some \$6 billion a year to achieve a program of this kind, and we still have a hard road ahead.

What would happen to our business abroad if we neglected to safeguard this freedom? In the extreme, we know what happened in Communist China. A printing company dismissed some of its employees. The new government ordered the company to rehire the employees and to give them back pay, and not to dismiss any more employees. It was then given an opportunity to purchase a large quantity of government bonds. Then it was given another opportunity to contribute heavily to the welfare fund of the union.

By this time, its working capital was gone. It turned to the banks, but they said no to the request for a loan. And so the firm decided to shut down. Then it discovered that it would not be allowed to shut down; it must go on doing business.

The managers were not allowed to leave the premises, but they were replaced as managing operators by officials respon-

sible either to the Communist party or to the government. This was the end of the business as a private undertaking.

This concrete illustration shows what the stake is in maintaining our foreign policy. It means for businessmen what it means for all of us in one way or another—the right to live and work as free, productive, and self-respecting human beings. (*Applause*)

Moderator Williams:

Thank you, Mr. Blaisdell. We will hear next from another newcomer to Town Meeting, Mr. H. W. Balgooyen, Secretary and Assistant Treasurer of the American and Foreign Power Company. As a successful businessman since his graduation from college, and as a director of the National Foreign Trade Council, Mr. Balgooyen is well qualified to give us his views tonight on the stake of business in our foreign policy. Mr. Balgooyen. (*Applause*)

Mr. Balgooyen:

For the purposes of this discussion, I believe it is useful to distinguish between foreign policy in its broader aspects, including national defense, and foreign economic policy, the field of particular interest to businessmen.

I am sure that we agree that the purpose of American foreign policy is to assure our national security and well-being and to preserve the integrity of our free institutions. To serve this purpose, our foreign policy must be directed toward the creation of an international environment in which free institutions can survive and flourish.

The chief concern of foreign economic policy should be the encouragement and protection of American foreign trade and foreign investment, the two fields which embrace most of our day-to-day contacts with foreign nations and people.

Consistent with this thesis, our government should strive to safeguard American investors abroad against confiscation of their properties, unfair treatment, and discrimination in any form. It should do all it can to eliminate foreign barriers against American goods, and it should make every effort to stimulate our imports of the useful raw materials, finished goods, and services we require to support our domestic economy and meet our defense needs.

The stake of American business in our foreign economic policy is quite beyond calculation. It can be visualized, however, in terms of our postwar foreign trade and service transactions of some \$25 billion per year; our \$12 billion of private

direct investments abroad; our \$26 billion in postwar foreign aid and the terrific tax burden borne by American business to help finance it; and by the inflation in our domestic costs and prices, to which our foreign aid program has contributed.

But the stake involved in our foreign economic policy far transcends these dollars and cents considerations. In a very real sense, the future of the world's most efficient and productive economic system is at stake in many of the policy decisions of our government. And the preservation and strengthening of our system of free, private, competitive enterprise with its incentives for effort and its rewards for accomplishment should be a matter of first concern to every businessman and, indeed, to every American.

The preservation of our free institutions necessarily involves considerations of domestic as well as foreign policy, and there is no surer way to defeat the purposes of our foreign policy than to undermine the foundations of our domestic economy by ill-conceived policy decisions based upon political expediency rather than economic realities.

Whatever our foreign responsibilities may be, we shall be better equipped to discharge them if we practice sound economics at home. Furthermore, we may be sure that the inconsistencies between the economic principles we preach and the policies we pursue are not unnoticed by the recipients of our gratuitous foreign aid and our equally gratuitous economic advice.

Mr. Blaisdell and I are close to agreement on what the foreign policy objectives of our government should be. Our differences relate to methods and points of emphasis. A businessman wants to know whether we are getting full value for the \$6 billion spent annually on foreign policy.

He questions the effectiveness of a program which seems to rely too heavily on government loans and handouts to accomplish its objectives. He wonders how long our domestic economy can stand up under the burden of subsidies, price supports, excessive spending at home, and foreign aid programs abroad. And he wonders how much our present economic policies really contribute to the objective of safeguarding our economic freedom and preserving it for future generations.

But I suppose the real question this evening is, "What is business doing to strengthen our foreign economic policy?" I believe the answer is, "Not enough," although businessmen are devoting more time and energy than ever before to study,

discussion, and publicity in this field. The National Foreign Trade Council, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States Council of the International Chamber—all have active committees of businessmen engaged in constant research and study, and their reports on matters of foreign economic policy are given wide publicity.

The National Association of Manufacturers' studies on the foreign investment potential of the United States and the problem of the foreign trade gap, the Foreign Trade Council's recommendations on Point Four, and the carefully prepared and widely circulated declarations of the Annual National Foreign Trade Conventions—each of which is a consensus of current business thinking on foreign economic policy—are examples of the constructive work that these organizations are doing.

These activities make great demands upon the time of foreign trade executives and business economists. And I would like to have Mr. Blaisdell's opinion as to whether all this effort is practical and worth while. Do our government officials in the Commerce and State Departments welcome the business viewpoint on current issues? And is the business viewpoint considered in reaching decisions on foreign economic policy to the same extent as is the viewpoint of labor and agriculture?

Is there any basis for the complaint of many businessmen that decisions vitally affecting foreign traders and investors have been made before they are called in for consultation? And is there any reason to fear government harassment or retaliation if an active part is taken in opposing favored legislation?

Foreign trade executives frequently are faced with these questions, and they must be answered if business is to make a more effective contribution to foreign economic policies. It is my own observation that during recent years there has been increasing evidence of a sincere desire by many of our government officials to enlist the coöperation of businessmen in the formulation of policy in this field. This is all to the good.

In this great democracy, business cannot and does not seek to impose its views on government, even on matters of primary concern to businessmen. All that we ask is a fair opportunity to be heard on policy matters that vitally affect our interests, with some assurance that our views will be carefully considered. (*Applause*)

Moderator Williams:

Thank you, Mr. Balgooyen. I think Mr. Balgooyen has put some questions which we should let Mr. Blaisdell answer immediately. Mr. Blaisdell.

Mr. Blaisdell: The most important question which Mr. Balgooyen put to us tonight I think is, "Does the government welcome business comment and business advice?"

I want to make the answer just as unequivocal as I know how. The answer is yes. However, I don't want to limit myself just to a yes.

I want to call your attention to the fact that some of the meetings, some of the conferences which he mentioned—such as those that have been held recently by the National Association of Manufacturers with regard to the development of the Reciprocal Trade program and the promotion of imports—were worked out jointly with people in Washington who were interested in this same kind of program.

I would like to remind you that the Marshall Plan was submitted to a committee known as the Harriman Committee of the President's committee on the Marshall program—before it was finally accepted and adopted by Congress.

Here were two outstanding examples of coöperation between government and business.

It's because I believe that fundamentally the business viewpoint is taken into account in Washington that I'm ready to stand here and say—and call your attention, as a matter of fact—to the point that at the moment business is better off in the United States than it's ever been in history. (Applause)

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Blaisdell. Does that satisfy you, Mr. Balgooyen, or would you like to rephrase a question before we get ready for our question period?

Mr. Balgooyen: I don't care to reply in detail to that statement. I think it's questionable as to whether business is better now than it has ever been at any time in our history. We have a great deal of inflation in this country. We're not talking about the dollar we talked about in 1939, certainly not the dollar we talked about in 1929. Our measurements are in dollars. We have a tremendous national debt, and I'm not sure that that statement would hold water.

As to his reply to my questions, I can only repeat that among businessmen there is some question as to whether their views on economic policy are considered in Washing-

ton, and as to whether any constructive action is taken as result of the representations that they make. There also is some question as to whether a public position taken on a matter that is close to administration policy might not involve harassment on the part of government.

I don't say that these things happen, but I say that businessmen are asking these questions and they need to be reassured if business is to play a more constructive role in foreign policy.

Mr. Williams: Thank you, Mr. Balgooyen. Now, while we get ready for our question period, here is a message for our Town Hall listeners.

Announcer: "The Stake of Business in Our Foreign Policy is only one of the important subjects we are scheduling for discussion this summer. In coming weeks, Town Meeting will consider freedom of speech — academic freedom — and timely topics on the domestic and international scene.

These are subjects of lasting importance, and they will be reprinted for your convenience in the Town Meeting Bulletin. Each issue contains the opening speeches as well as the questions and answers to follow. If you will be unable to hear some of these programs during the summer months, you'll want to keep well informed by reading both sides as authorities see them. Even if you do hear the broadcast, you will find the Bulletins excellent for reference and background material. Single copies are 10 cents each. A one-year subscription is \$4.50, or you may subscribe for 11 weeks for just \$1. Send your order tonight to Town Hall, New York 17, New York. And now for our audience questions, we return you to our guest moderator, Chester Williams.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Williams: Now Mr. Blaisdell and Mr. Balgooyen, if you're ready for the questions, let's start with a question over here for Mr. Balgooyen.

Man: What is our government doing to protect the interests of our investors abroad?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Balgooyen, that was Mr. Alfred Landon of Kansas, who was a presidential candidate in 1936.

Mr. Balgooyen: I think I can answer that the same way that I answered my own question as to what business is going on in the field of foreign policy. I think the answer is, "Not enough." Our government is working very hard at the present time on a negotiation of treaties of friendship, commerce, and economic development with a number of countries. This is a very constructive move, and I certainly hope that this program will be successful; but I cannot say truthfully that American business abroad is getting all the protection that we would like to have.

Man: What would the effect on international trade be if all subsidies to domestic enterprises were revoked?

Mr. Williams: The question is for Mr. Blaisdell.

Mr. Blaisdell: The problem of domestic subsidies, while not entirely separate from the problem of foreign trade, is very considerably separate, and the problem should be separated. It is important, however, that some of our domestic industries that function particularly in terms of the maintenance of their exports should be given the kind of protection which they now receive if they're to continue.

What we've been trying to do in connection with subsidies to these export industries is to iron out some of the ups and downs which do come and which, it has been found in the past, we've been unable to take care of through the ordinary ways of the market.

Mr. Williams: All right, next question. Over here for Mr. Balgooyen.

Man: Isn't the basic issue the degree to which the government will control, operate, and exercise the program of international trade development?

Mr. Williams: Mr. Balgooyen, that question comes from Dr. Lawrence Appley, President of the American Management Association, who's here this week at this Conference.

Mr. Balgooyen: I think that that really is the basic question. It's the thing that we're all concerned about. We know

what the world trend is in regard to increasing intervention by the state in economic affairs. We're a little bit fearful that things have gone that way a little bit in our own government and that's particularly true in the international field, where our government has put a dollar sign on economic policy.

We heard Mr. Blaisdell ask the question as to what was being done about economic policy abroad. He said we're spending \$6 billion a year, and he used the example of China as an example of the success or lack of success of this program. Now I think that that was a very unfortunate example whatever we think about the China situation. I think it isn't

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

H. W. BALGOOYEN—Mr. Balgooyen is secretary and assistant treasurer of the American and Foreign Power Company, and a director of the National Foreign Trade Council.

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, Jr.—Economist and former chief of the Mission for Economic Affairs with the rank of Minister, London, England, Mr. Blaisdell is currently assistant secretary of commerce for international trade.

He studied at Alma (Michigan) College and in Berlin before graduating with an A.B. from Pennsylvania State College in 1916. Six years later, he graduated from New York School of Social Work and in 1932 received a Ph.D. from Columbia University.

Mr. Blaisdell then taught history at Ewing Christian College in India for four years and from 1922-25 taught sociology and economics at Yenching University, Peking. Returning to the States, he was a member of the faculty of Columbia University Department of Economics from 1925-33. He has been in government service since 1933, serving in various capacities in different departments. He has been assistant secretary of commerce since May, 1948.

Mr. Blaisdell is the author of *Federal Trade Commission, an Experiment in Control of Business*, and *Peking Rugs and Peking Boys* (with C. C. Chu), and is a contributor to government bulletins.

CHESTER S. WILLIAMS—The former director of the first World Town Hall Seminar, Mr. Williams is deputy chief of public information of the United States Mission to the United Nations, a post for which he is well suited because of his background.

He is a graduate of the University of California (A.B., 1930), having spent two years traveling in 14 countries in Europe, Japan, and China for the Confederation des Etudiants. Following graduation, he became a free-lance writer and a lecturer at adult education forums. From 1934-1941, Mr. Williams was employed in the Office of Education. For the next two years, he was in special charge of educational programs, lectures, films, etc., for the O. W. I., and from 1944-45, he was chief educational director of programs for UNRRA.

matter of the dollars we spend, but how effectively we spend the dollars.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Blaisdell, do you want to comment on that before we pick up the next question?

Mr. Blaisdell: I'd like to comment particularly on the expenditure of funds abroad, because I do feel that this expenditure of money has been one of the best expenditures that we could possibly have made. We were dealing with a world which was falling to pieces. We were dealing with a world where the only sources of supplies that were available were in the United States. Those supplies were made available, primarily, for the development and the rebuilding over a period of time of private enterprise institutions; and the progress that has been made, I think, has been obvious from the data which comes in and the reports which come in on every hand as to the success of that particular program.

Mr. Williams: All right, the next question from over here.

Man: I'd like to ask Mr. Blaisdell a question. Must not friendly countries be discouraged by the failure of Congress to pass the I. T. O. and the Customs Simplification Act?

Mr. Williams: Did you hear that question, Mr. Blaisdell?

Mr. Blaisdell: I think the answer is that the eyes of a great many countries are on the United States. The lead which we give them in the development of legislation which will free trade is the kind of lead they are looking for. If we go backward in the direction of tighter regulations, they will probably follow. If we go forward, I would guess that they would follow us there, because we have a lot of latent support that's just looking for leadership.

Mr. Williams: This next question is for Mr. Balgooyen.

Man: Can the American faith in its free enterprise system be best sold abroad by the American labor movement rather than, say, by management itself?

Mr. Balgooyen: I think that there's a great deal that the American labor movement can do to sell our ideas of economic and political freedom, and I think that our labor movement is trying to do that. I know the American Federation of Labor has been active recently in Latin America in organizing a labor movement which is free and democratic and opposed to the communist-influenced labor movement, which was very active in Latin America and still is quite active. And I think that that is one of the most constructive things that has happened in the field of inter-American relations.

Man: My question is to Mr. Blaisdell. Local Chambers of Commerce and, regrettably, even labor unions have opposed imports from Marshall Plan countries. What can be done to reëducate them?

Mr. Williams: I'm afraid we're going to have to leave this question for the postforums all over the country. Thank you Mr. Balgooyen and Mr. Blaisdell.

And now in just a moment, I'll tell you about our subject and speakers for next week.

Announcer: Whether you've heard every Town Meeting since 1935 or are listening tonight for the very first time, you'll be interested in our 15th Anniversary book titled *Good Evening, Neighbors*. Long-time listeners will find much to remember in this attractive publication and will enjoy testing their memories of famous Town Meetings of years ago. New listeners will want to read the dramatic history of the program. Students and teachers will probably turn first to the section on the Junior Town Meetings. And if you followed our programs around the world last summer, you'll be interested in Chester Williams' report and the picture of all the overseas broadcasts. And we guarantee all Town Meeting listeners a hearty chuckle from the cartoon which Al Capp drew especially for our 15th Anniversary. These and many other features are included in our 80-page book titled *Good Evening, Neighbors*. For your copy, send \$1 to Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

And now for news of next week's program, here is Chester Williams.

Mr. Williams: First, on behalf of Town Hall, I want to thank our Colgate University hosts, President Everett Case and his associates, Charles R. Wilson, Lloyd Huntley, and Donald Frick for their hospitality and coöperation. If you want a copy of tonight's broadcast, send 10 cents to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. If you have not yet ordered your copy of our 15th Anniversary book, *Good Evening, Neighbors*, the thrilling and dramatic story of Town Meeting, do so tonight. The price is \$1, and the address again is Town Hall, New York 18, New York.

Next week, we turn to the international situation when we discuss, "How Can We Strengthen Our World Position?" Our speakers will be Norman Thomas, Socialist leader, and Brigadier General Frank L. Howley, former U. S. Commandant in Berlin, who spoke to our group last summer. The guests

moderator will be John Temple Graves, syndicate columnist for the *Birmingham Post*. The broadcast will originate in Mobile, Alabama, under the auspices of the Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Town Meeting Association of Mobile. The following week, on July 25, we will be in Nashville, Tennessee, in connection with the seventh Annual Institute of Higher Education, sponsored by Scarritt College for Christian Workers, George Peabody College, and Vanderbilt University.



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

Single copies 10c each from TOWN HALL, Inc.
Town Hall, New York 18, N. Y.

Twenty-six consecutive issues will be sent for only \$2.35.

Yearly subscription rate—\$4.50.

VOLUME 15

1. Television 1950—Is It Good or Bad?
2. Should the Senate Remove Restrictions on Margarine Now?
3. Is the Kremlin's Aim the Conquest of the United States?
4. What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?
5. Should President Truman's Civil Rights Program Be Adopted?
6. How Can We Be Successful Parents?
7. How Can We Secure Peace in a Hydrogen-Bomb World?
8. Do Our Movies Abroad Speak for America?
9. How Will the British Elections Affect the United States?
10. What Should American Business Do About Point Four?
11. How Can Organized Religion Advance American Democracy?
12. What Should We Do About Federal Aid to Education?
13. What Kind of Farm Program Do We Need?
14. Should We Cut Marshall Plan Aid Now?

50. Do We Have an Alternative to the Cold War?
51. What Effect Do Our Race Relations Have on Our Foreign Policy?
52. How Can We Best Insure Loyalty of United States Citizens and Officials?

VOLUME 16

1. How Should Business and Government Deal With Unemployment?
2. Is the American Press Doing Its Job Today?
3. To What Extent Is Government Responsible for Social Welfare?
4. Are Divorces Ruining Our Children?
5. What Progress May We Expect in the Next Half Century?
6. Are We Fighting Communism Wisely?
7. When Are We Too Old To Work?
8. What Are the Real Issues in the 1950 Congressional Elections?
9. What Does the Korean Invasion Mean to the United States and the United Nations?
10. Is the Fair Deal Destroying Individual Responsibility?

versity. Our subject will be, "Is Freedom of Speech Threatened in America?" The speakers will be Abe Fortas, former Under Secretary of the Interior, and Henry J. Taylor, author, foreign correspondent, and ABC commentator. The Guest Moderator will be Dr. Clarence Decker, president of the University of Kansas City. The August 1 Town Meeting will originate in Enid, Oklahoma, under the auspices of Phillips University and the Forum Committee of the Enid Chamber of Commerce. On August 8, we will broadcast from Duluth, Minnesota. If you live in any of these cities, or expect to visit them, we hope to see you at Town Meeting.

And before I make my last comment, may I say greetings to our boys in Korea.

So plan to be with us next week and every week at the sound of the Crier's bell. (Applause)